

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCK		NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/674,369	10/27/2000	William F. Aftoora	WEA-1100	6931	
7	590 03/11/2003				
Joseph G Curatolo Renner Kenner Greive Bobak Taylor & Weber			EXAMINER		
	Ridge Road Suite 280	PRATT, HELEN F			
Westlake, OH 44145			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1761	14.	
			DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003	14	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No).	Applicant(s)	<u> </u>	
	•	09/674,369		AFTOORA, WILLIAN F.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit		
		Helen F. Pratt		1761		
Period fo	Th MAILING DATE of this communication app		er sheet with the c		ess	
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repliperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, howard the statutory must be statutory must be supply and will expire the application	wever, may a reply be tim inimum of thirty (30) days e SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	ely filed will be considered timely. he mailing date of this comm	nunication.	
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21.	January 2003 .				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) Th	is action is non-	final.			
3)□ Dispositi	Since this application is in condition for allowations of closed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims	ance except for Ex parte Quayle	formal matters, pro , 1935 C.D. 11, 49	osecution as to the r 53 O.G. 213.	nerits is	
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application	1.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from conside	ration.			
5) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election require	ement.			
	on Papers					
9) 🗌 🗆	he specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
ר 🔲 (10	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	oted or b)□ objec	ted to by the Exam	niner.		
_	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
11) 🔲 🏻	he proposed drawing correction filed on	. is: a)□ approv	ed b)⊡ disapprov	ed by the Examiner.		
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	•	tion.			
	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) 🗌 .	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119(a)-	(d) or (f).		
a)[All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been rece	eived.			
:	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been rece	eived in Application	n No ,		
	B. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bur se the attached detailed Office action for a list of	ity documents ha	ave been received	in this National Sta	ge	
	knowledgment is made of a claim for domestic				olication).	
a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language prov cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestion	visional applicati	on has been recei	ved.	, , .	
Attachment(•	00			
2) Notice 3) Inform	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	4) 🔀 5) 🔲 6) 🔲	Interview Summary (I Notice of Informal Par Other:	PTO-413) Paper No(s) tent Application (PTO-15	2)	
S. Patent and Trac TO-326 (Rev.	0.4.043	ion Summarv		Part of Pane	N 40	



Art Unit: 1761

al.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-42 are indefinite in the use of the term "substantially excludes acidulent components". The metes and bounds of the claims are not known when the claims include the term "substantially".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6-9, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Luber et al.

The claims are rejected for the reasons of record cited in the last office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luber et Claim 10 is rejected for the reasons of record cited in the last office action.

Art Unit: 1761

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 5, 11, 13-42 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 1-21-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue as to the phrase "substantially excludes acidulent components" in that it is a well accepted phrase and that if acidulent materials were excluded from the acidity-reducing formulation, then it would have been easier to raise the pH of the acidic food and that would have been within the skill of the ordinary worker. However, when the amount of acidity is the entire basis of the claim, one needs to know how much acid can be found in the composition in order to rule out other compositions.

Applicants argue that the composition of Luber is designed to treat gastric reflux. However, applicant's claims are to a composition whose ingredients have been shown.

Applicants argue as to Luber et al. that the reference does not teach the whole invention, specifically the use of sorbates or benzoates. However, such are very well known preservatives and are readily available. Therefore, it would have been obvious to substitute one preservative for another.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 09/674,369

at telephone number 703-308-1978.

Art Unit: 1761

Page 4

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Helen F. Pratt

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

Hp 3-6-03